DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 088 EA 025 590

AUTHOR Wendel, Frederick C., Ed.
TITLE Reforming and Restructuring Education. UCEA Monograph Series.
INSTITUTION University Council for Educational Administration.
REPORT NO ISBN-1-55996-151-1; ISSN-1041-3502
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 54p.; Papers originally presented at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration (Pittsburgh, PA, 1990).
AVAILABLE FROM University Council for Educational Administration, 212 Rackley Bldg., Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802-3200.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Educational Administration; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Organizational Theories; Resistance to Change; *School Based Management; *School Restructuring; *Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

This booklet contains four selected conference papers on educational reform and restructuring. In "Can Rational Organization Models Really Reform Anything? A Case Study of Reform in Chicago," Fenwick English describes reform efforts in the Chicago Public Schools and examines the political, social, organizational, and bureaucratic factors that have obstructed educational change. "Organizing and Leading for Learning: The Interplay of School Reform and Restructuring with Preparation Program Reform and Restructuring" focuses on how to prepare leaders to work effectively with context and input variables to guide improvement in education. In this paper, Charles M. Achilles, Dale Brubaker, and Harold Snyder plot the use of knowledge from practice and from theory as a guide for future challenges. John Greer, Paula Short, and Robert Michael describe the results of a funded project in "Issues in Creating Empowered Schools." They identify six variables that affected the success of the restructuring project and the creation of empowered staffs. Finally, Robert Prickett, Jack Flanigan, Mike Richardson, and Garth Petrie present findings of a study that examined three groups' perceptions of a popular restructuring strategy. Their paper, "Who Knows What? Site-Based Management," describes the different perceptions about site-based management held by principals, professors, and graduate students. References accompany each chapter. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 366 088

REFORMING AND RESTRUCTURING EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Forsyth

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MONOGRAPH SERIES
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FOR
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

uc ea

2

EA 025590

REFORMING AND RESTRUCTURING EDUCATION

UCEA MONOGRAPH SERIES

Frederick C. Wendel
Series Editor

University Council for Educational Administration
212 Rackley Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802-3200

3

ISSN: 1041-3505-2
ISBN: 1-55996-151-1

Copyright © 1992 by UCEA, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any other information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

CONTENTS

Chapter 1 7
Can Rational Organizational Models Really Reform Anything? A Case Study of Reform in Chicago
Fenwick C. English

Chapter 2 21
Organizing and Leading for Learning: The Interplay of School Reform and Restructuring with Preparation Program Reform and Restructuring
Charles M. Achilles, Dale Brubaker, and Harold Snyder

Chapter 3 41
Issues in Creating Empowered Schools
Paula Myrick Short, John T. Greer, and Robert Michael

Chapter 4 49
Who knows What? Site-Based Management
Robert Prickett, Jack Flanigan, Mike Richardson, and Garth Petrie

FOREWORD

Members of the Editorial Board have selected papers for inclusion in this UCEA Monograph Series on the general theme of "Reforming and Restructuring Education." They were originally presented at the 1990 Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration in Pittsburgh. Larry Dlugosh, Ron Joekel, John Prasch, and Ruth Randall reviewed the manuscripts and selected the papers for this issue. Their time, effort, analysis of the manuscripts, and thoughtful contributions are deeply appreciated.

Can reform on a massive scale, under intense public scrutiny work? Fenwick English describes reform efforts in the Chicago Public Schools. "Can Rational Organizational Models Really Reform Anything? A Case Study of Reform in Chicago" is an examination of the political, social, organizational, and bureaucratic factors that have stunted reforms in the Windy City.

"Organizing and Leading for Learning: The Interplay of School Reform and Restructuring with Preparation Program Reform and Restructuring" is a challenging essay on how to prepare leaders to work effectively with context and input variables to guide improvement in education. Chuck Achilles, Dale Brubaker, and Harold Snyder plot the use of knowledge from practice and from theory as a guide through the uncharted seas that lie ahead.

Jack Greer, Paula Short, and Robert Michael describe the results of a funded project in "Issues in Creating Empowered Schools." What accounted for success in the restructuring project? Six themes emerged as significant and powerful issues in creating empowered staffs and are illustrative of the variables that confront change agents.

Robert Prickett, Jack Flanigan, Mike Richardson, and Garth Petrie conducted a study of three groups' perceptions of a popular restructuring strategy. "Who Knows What? Site-Based Management" reports on the perceptions of principals, professors, and graduate students about site-based management. Their conclusions should send us back to the library to find out more about the popular movement.

Collectively these papers have much to offer about reform and restructuring. Fundamental changes are needed. The more fundamental the needed change, the more complex the change process becomes. The more complex the change process becomes . . .

Frederick C. Wendel, Editor
Lincoln, Nebraska
July, 1992

CHAPTER 1

CAN RATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL MODELS REALLY REFORM ANYTHING? A CASE STUDY OF REFORM IN CHICAGO

Fenwick W. English
University of Kentucky

In 1988, the General Assembly of Illinois passed the Chicago School Reform Act (P.A. 85-1418). This Act mandated the following changes in the Chicago Public Schools (CPS):

1. the creation of Local School Councils (LSC) at every school to consist of eleven members: six parents, two teachers, two community residents, and the principal. The Council has numerous duties: planning, curriculum development, the development of a budget and the responsibility to select and/or terminate the services of the school principal.
2. the creation of District Councils composed of one local school council member from each school. District Councils will select and/or terminate the services of the District Superintendent. Each district council will elect one of its members to serve on the Board Nominating Commission, along with five at-large members selected by the Mayor. The commission will select three school board candidates for each Board opening to present to the Mayor for mayoral appointment.
3. the creation of an interim school board and the development of a new fifteen member board, serving staggered four year terms.
4. that principals serve under a four-year performance-based contract.
5. the creation at each school of a Professional Personnel Advisory Committee that will advise the principal and local council on educational matters and help configure the school's educational program.
6. the conduct of a national search for a new General Superintendent.
7. the directive that 100% of Chapter 1 funds follow the students who generate them. A five-year period was established to phase out basic programs under Chapter 1 so that only supplementary services would eventually be supported.
8. the establishment of an *administrative cap* or ceiling for spending on administration. By 1989-90 the proportion of administrative spending to instructional spending ratio in Chicago must not be greater than the average ratio for the State. The savings was expected to be in the range of $40 to $50 million per year.

9. that by 1991-92 the CPS Board must implement a program that includes choice of schools for students to attend with low income students being provided transportation.
10. that the Board of Education develop an annual *Reform Plan* setting forth its goals and objectives on a systemwide basis.[1] Both the financial and reform plans would be monitored by the Chicago school Finance Authority.[2]

Impact of the Reform Act

The Chicago Public Schools is the city's second largest employer and the fourth largest in the State. As of October 31, 1989, the CPS Board of Education employed 42,048 persons *excluding* substitutes, of which 56.3% or 23,684 were teachers.[3] Its operational budget for 1990 was $2.203 billion dollars. The revenue streams are 12% federal, 42% state, and 42% local.[4] The local property tax supplies 38%. Pupil membership is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. *Racial Composition of Students in the Chicago Public Schools*

	Membership		Change	
Group	**1970**	**1988**	**Number**	**Percent**
White	199,669	49,234	- 150,435	- 75
Black	316,711	240,113	- 76,598	- 24
Hispanic	56,374	106,663	+ 50,289	+ 89
Asian, American Indian	4,925	12,432	+ 7,507	+152
TOTALS	577,679	408,442	-169,237	-29

Nearly one-quarter of all public school students in Illinois attend the Chicago Public Schools. Student characteristics are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. *Student Characteristics in Chicago and Illinois*

Characteristic	**Chicago**	**Illinois**	**Illinois Excl. Chicago**
Student Attendance	89.7%	93.3%	94.3%
Low-Income Students	66.7%	26.0%	16.5%
Student Mobility	35.9%	21.5%	17.2%
Limited English	9.2%	3.5%	0.7%
Elementary-Retained	4.0%	2.3%	1.8%
H.S. Graduation	47.0%	78.0%	87.1%
Chronically Truant	3.6%	1.8%	NA

Test data for CPS students from the *Illinois Goal Assessment Program* (IGAP) are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. *Comparisons of Students' Reading Success in Chicago with Illinois*

Percent of Students in Each Quarter (Reading)
1988-89

	Third Grade		Sixth Grade		Eighth Grade	
Quarter	CPS	State	CPS	State	CPS	State
Top	15.0	35.2	12.8	29.0	12.6	26.3
Third	17.5	24.1	17.7	23.8	19.8	24.6
Second	22.9	19.9	28.8	24.3	31.5	26.3
Bottom	44.7	20.7	40.7	22.8	36.1	22.8

Over 50% of the current school facilities were constructed prior to 1940. Sixty-five (65) schools are overcrowded, largely in Hispanic areas of the city.[5] The picture which emerges of the Chicago Public Schools is one of a lethargic leviathan with an enormous appetite for jobs and money. The Chicago Public Schools is viewed in the public eye as a gigantic totalitarian bureaucracy and is referred to simply as "Pershing Road,"[6] the street on which the district's headquarters are located.

The ineptitude and incompetency of the CPS administration were recently underscored in communications to the School Finance Authority when the reform group, *Designs for Change*, noted, ". . . the Pershing Road bureaucracy has, over the years, developed a sophisticated array of delaying and stonewalling tactics that they have used to neutralize oversight agencies."[7]

Still another communique was more acerbic:

> One aspect of the District Service Center proposal is the fact that Pershing Road staff will simply be shifted to the districts, with *no school voice* in deciding whether these bureaucrats are competent to help the schools and the LSCs. The *same people who have been hanging up on you*, giving you false information, and creating phony deadlines for the last year will now be housed in an office in your part of the city. The Superintendent has never explained why this will solve the problems that he himself admits are critical.[8]

Many individuals and reform groups in Chicago envision the Chicago School Reform Act as a way of:

1. shrinking the bureaucracy and abolishing the "top-down" decision-making staff of the past;
2. redistributing the "power" and money to the individual schools where parents and teachers, those closest to the action, will decide what is best for the children (or "empowering" as it is sometimes referred to);

3. improving the flow of resources and services to the schools;
4. freeing the schools from the "deadening hand" of the central bureaucrats in curriculum and instruction.

To date, very few of these aspirations have been realized. The talk and rhetoric are thick. The reality is much bleaker. To date, the single major accomplishment of the Chicago School Reform Act has been the creation of the Local School Councils. Elections were held in 541 elementary and high schools. Some 17,000 plus candidates competed for 5,410 available seats and over 300,000 ballots were cast (Chicago Public Schools, 1990, p. 232). As of August, 1990, every school in Chicago did not have a functional school council and more than a few have become bogged down in personality conflicts, local power plays, and lack of experience in group decision making. A long-time cynical observer of the scene observed that giving the "power" to the people didn't cost anything and the politicians don't want it to work anyway.

What Isn't Working in Chicago?

The Chicago effort is an example of the concept of organizational rationality, the notion that shifting the goals and objectives for a system will ultimately change its behavior and actions, and the results or outcomes will be different or improve (Silver, 1983). The assumption is that human actions are purposive in the aggregate and can be shaped by delineating clearly what the aims are *to direct the aggregate*. The Chicago School Reform effort provides plenty of evidence that the assumption is either wrong or that the aggregate behavior is inadequate or incompetent if it can be directed.

A first-hand impression of the Chicago situation based on meetings with personnel within and without the system and a review of the required planning reform documents has resulted in these observations:

1. *Great confusion regarding roles and responsibilities within and without the system.* The old Abbott and Costello gag about 'Who's on first?' is an apt analogy to the situation in CPS at present. Community representatives do not know whom to call or who to blame if they do not get the resources they have requested, or if something is late. Many do not see the dichotomy between blaming central administration for problems like late buses or materials and the condemnation for top-down decision making. The contradiction is that to solve some school related problems will require greater coordination and centralization, not less, hence more top-down decisions.

2. *Contradictory "pulls" within the Reform Act itself.* The contradiction between what is supposed to be centralized and what is not is embedded in the Chicago Reform Act itself. Two examples may suffice: The Reform Act

makes the central Board of Education responsible for carrying out many of the reforms and filing a plan to do so, yet also contains language that gives much power to the Local School Councils. While the LSCs have new responsibilities and new authority, the councils do not have much accountability to ensure that reform occurs. That is left to the central board and central staff to insure. Any move by the central administration to improve coordination or to ensure that necessary documents or events happen is met with a wall of resistance by reverting to the old habits of the bureaucracy. So the central administration and the board have become very defensive about their role in "pushing reforms" at the local school level. Central officials are "snakebitten" by charges of interference or heavy handedness when some central actions are clearly necessary to move the system. Whether this is a genuine response or one of *diligent indecisiveness*, a common bureaucratic malady, is difficult to tell.

The second illustration of a major contradiction within the legislation itself occurs in testing and curriculum development.

Curriculum development is a responsibility clearly located at the individual school level in the Chicago Reform Act. The Act mandates that a standardized test be the *ultimate determiner* as to whether the reform effort has been successful. Standardized testing has always been a force for curricular centralization, not decentralization. By empowering the schools to develop their own curriculum, the probabilities that local school curricula will be radically different, uncoordinated with each other or duplicative, is vastly enhanced. Under this scenario even if students come to school in greater numbers and learner gusto is enhanced, the chances that improved test scores will result are quite dim. On the contrary, test scores might decline further. Instead of a standardized test being an adequate measure of reform content or actions, a test is simply registering the extent to which test content is curriculum content and taught (a concept called alignment).

Ostensibly, curriculum alignment is supposed to be rectified by developing a centralized curriculum framework with system goals and objectives into which a local school's curriculum is supposed to be shaped. Tests do not, however, measure goals and objectives; they measure specific content. The presence of goals and objectives does not ensure content alignment and so the problem of an uncoordinated and unarticulated curriculum existing within a framework is a very high probability in Chicago. In short, there is an incompatibility between the *means* embraced in the Reform Act (local school autonomy) and the *ends* used to assess them (a central system test).

3. *Attenuated Bureaucratic Blindspots*. In addition to the usual bureaucratic dysfunctions such as "trained capacity" identified by Merton (1968)

and internal isolation and rigidity, bureaucracies have organizational blindspots that prevent them from perceiving the need for data or for taking action in specific areas. CPS is not an exception to this observation. In the first review of the CPS Board's Reform Plan in February of 1990, the following blindspots or admissions contained in that plan to the School Finance Authority are noted (English, 1990).

> Many of the Board's assumptions and base line data statements are candid confessions of what is not known or not available in the Chicago Public Schools. A perusal of the Board's proposed Reform Plan includes these admissions:
> a. There are no formally approved graduation requirements (p. 52).
> b. Some subject areas have no objectives or standards (p. 75).
> c. Systemwide statistics are unavailable to assess native language achievement of students in bilingual education programs (p. 128).
> d. A comprehensive plan for placement, course development, and assessment is not available for Spanish-speaking high school students (p. 128).
> e. Present policy for foreign language instruction does not meet the needs of colleges, universities, or the market place (p. 123).
> f. An overall staff development plan is not in place (p. 137).
> g. The Board lacks comprehensive data about the subsequent education and employment of those who graduate and those who drop out of the Chicago Public Schools (p. 151).
> h. There is no procedure established to systematically collect data about the job market and employability of graduates and dropouts (p. 161).
> i. Current vocational programs are not necessarily relevant to the changing job market (p. 163).

4. *A Proclivity Toward Inaction.* The CPS bureaucracy is a case in studied inaction. The bureaucratic mentality is to avoid acting upon exceptions but only to take action on cases that fit "the rules." Thus bureaucracies are notoriously unable to engage in implementing innovation or promoting rapid change (Mintzberg, 1983).

This tendency was no more apparent than in review of the actual "reforms" or changes embodied in the CPS Board's initial draft of the required *Reform Plan:*

> A close reading of the Board's Reform Plan reveals very little reform at all is contained in the two hundred sixty-one page document. Most of the identified reform "action steps" are bureaucratic maneuvers and in-house "non-actions."
>
> The Board's Reform Plan consists of 26 goals broken down into 51 objectives. These are followed by a listing of approximately 233 separate reform "action steps" to be taken in 1989-90; 167 action steps delineated for 1990-91; and 158 for 1991-92.
>
> Of the approximate 233 so-called action steps to be initiated in 1989-90, possibly only 15 or 6% could be called significant reform which may reinforce the movement toward school based management.
>
> The remainder of the so-called "action steps" are the product of elaborate

paper shuffling. Nearly 95% of all the so-called "action steps" are nothing more than gathering, analyzing, refining data, studying, surveying, preparing reports, disseminating data, distributing reports, establishing data systems, calling and attending meetings, preparing minutes, verifying reports, preparing guidelines, updating manuals, establishing councils, developing designs, establishing task forces, developing brochures, seeking funding, drafting legislation, division plans, establishing councils and consortia, developing models and producing assorted other paperwork including one action step to reduce paperwork by producing "procedural guidelines," i.e., more paper.

In short, there is very little actual reform in the Board's plan, but a lot to keep all of the downtown administrators quite busy for three years. Significant reforms in the first year are too limited in nature to produce much of an overall system impact. The Board's Reform Plan is an example of "too little and too late."(English, 1990).

The Rational Model at Work: Regulations of the School Finance Authority

The Chicago School Finance Authority (SFA) is a statutory body with designated responsibilities to oversee the Board's finances and the reform effort. The Authority was created nearly ten years ago when the district encountered major financial problems and the Board could not meet its fiduciary obligations. To restore public confidence and to expedite the borrowing needs of the schools, the Finance Authority was formed. Members of the Authority are selected by the Mayor of Chicago and the Governor in joint appointments.

To facilitate the submission of the Board's Reform Plan, the SFA drafted its own regulations. The regulations are an example of the assumption of rationality inherent in its content and scope. In fact, the regulations are examples of *hyperrationalization* (Wise, 1979).

General Requirements of the SFA
for the CPS Board of Education Reform Plan
Regulation 80-6-1

b. General Requirements

(i) Statement of Goal and Objective
Each goal and objective shall be described and defined. This statement shall reflect the cumulative effect of the Local School Council's School Improvement Plans.

(ii) Determination of Baseline and Annual Achievement Benchmarks
(a) The presentation of each goal and objective shall begin by establishing a baseline from which future progress can be measured. The baseline will be an explanation and measurement of the existing situation before implementation of the Reform Plan. The Board shall explain the methodology of deriving the baseline and shall justify its use. This requirement will also apply to the determination of national norms and to the use of standardized tests.

(b) In order to detect problems in the progress being made early enough to take corrective action, provisions shall be made for periodic reviews and measurements of progress toward the desired goal, with particular emphasis on the measurement of student learning by the demonstration of acquired skills. This will also require that the Board, using the same methodology, establish benchmarks to be met in each year of the Reform Plan so as to measure annual achievement and compare it with the ultimate goal and objective.

(iii) Reform Strategy and Implement

(a) After establishing the baseline, the Board shall explain in detail the program that it intends to follow in order to attain the goal and objective in question within the required time. Such program may contain various alternative approaches to be used at local schools in accordance with applicable School Improvement Plans. Such explanation should begin with all the assumptions on which the program is based. It should then present a description of each step of the program to be implemented during the school years covered by the Reform Plan, with special emphasis on any curriculum and teaching techniques involved and their expected impact on the learning and development skills of the students. The description shall also include such accountability and monitoring structures as are necessary to (1) effectively monitor and evaluate school-based decision making in relation to changes in the central administrative structure, and (2) identify what factors, with particular focus on aspects of the curriculum or teaching, are responsible for student improvement.

(b) If all or any part of the proposed program has been tried before, the results thereof shall be fully described with the reasons for such results. If the program was not successful before, the Board shall explain why it can now be expected to succeed.

(c) Each presentation shall include an analysis of the cost of the program, by years, and shall provide an explanation of whether funding is currently available, is anticipated from specific future revenues or is beyond the foreseeable resources of the Board.

(d) Each goal and objective shall be assigned a priority in relation to all others, in case there are insufficient funds to implement all of them. The priority assigned shall give recognition to statutory mandates, the impact of the goal and objective on educational progress, the feasibility of implementation of programs to achieve them and any other identified pertinent factors" (SFA Rev. 8/31/89, pp. 6-3, 6-4).

This regulation, as Wise (1979) has pointed out in his work regarding *hyperrationalization*, virtually assumes the existence of a science of education in which the relationships of means to ends and technique to specified results can be determined. Furthermore, that science would permit costs to be assigned to these means and ends. In fact, such a science does not exist.

A "metanarrative" runs through the SFA's Regulation that is also found in the Chicago School Reform Act.[9] Wise (1979) outlines this metanarrative:

1. Educational goals must be limited.
2. Goals must be put in a form that are assessable.
3. Tests are devised to assess performance. Comparison of scores from these tests facilitates school improvement.
4. For children who arrive at school less prepared than others, the schools must be adjusted downward or given additional resources to add services.
5. Education is provided in a cost-efficient manner.
6. Rules and procedures are superior to the exercise of judgement as a means to promote equality and equity.

In turn this metanarrative is supported by these assumptions:

1. Children are pliable within a range of normal aptitude and expectation.
2. Teachers are pliable and will modify their behavior to comply with regulations, plans, court orders, etc.
3. A science of education exists which yields treatments that can be applied by system officials.
4. People will select cost effectiveness behavior that can be demonstrated over that which is not cost effective (Wise, 1979).

Hyperrationalization is a term which refers to a process of increasing reliance of centralized decision making and policy development resulting in increasing bureaucratic overlay without being able to attain the desired objectives (Wise, 1979). Wise brings into focus the limits of organizational rationality. These factors appear to be at least partially responsible for the inability of central policy decisions to impact educational reform in Chicago or elsewhere:

1. *Loose Structural Coupling.* Educational organizations are not tight line/staff hierarchies. They are much looser in composition than imagined by either laypersons or legislators (Weick, 1976).

2. *Retrospective Rationality.* When educational organizations resort to rationality, they do so after they have acted and not before. Rationality is used not to direct but to conceal or explain actions after the fact. Therefore, goals do not guide but they may explain. This phenomena has been called "retrospective rationality" as opposed to "prospective rationality." (Palumbo, 1985).

> Although at times organizations attempt to be rational in the prospective sense, most often they are rational only in the retrospective sense. Hence, organizational behavior is rational, but only in the sense that organizations act first, then analyze what they did . . . intention seldom, if ever, controls action; but because we assume that what appeared to happen did happen, we often conclude that rational models actually work when, in fact, they do not (Palumbo).

3. *Bureaucracy is Capable of Being Decentralized.* The railing of the critics in Chicago against bureaucracy or "Pershing Road" and the cries for improved decentralization will not abolish bureaucracy because it can be decentralized and still work (Wise, 1979). The centralization/decentralization dichotomy can be carried within a bureaucracy successfully without leading to the development of internal bureaucratic antibodies being injected into the system from which it ultimately perishes. Bureaucracies are too complex to be so fatally stricken with such a simple malady.

4. *Individual Behavior is Not Guided by Organizational Goals Stated in Abstract Form.* The idea that organizational goals can serve as a basis for defining or adjusting individual behavior ignores the fact that rarely are such goals stated in such a way that individual behaviors can be defined from them. Most often, even good organizational goals are not stated in individual behaviors but in the form of organizational outcomes or products or in the guise of student behavioral gains on a test. Such goals are too abstract to be explicit guides to individual actions.

5. *Individual Behavior is More Apt to be Guided by Group Norms and These May Reinforce Bureaucracy and Non-Goal Directed Behavior.* Teachers are usually sensitive to group norms within their own ranks (Lortie, 1969). When these norms are encapsulated into a union, they become formalized in contract language. Unionized action usually works to perpetuate the norms of bureaucracy such as impartiality, impersonality, and a rigid reliance on precedence and rules. Reliance on these strategies restrains the actions of administrators and, hence, limits their power to bring about conformance to organizational goals (Wise, 1974).

6. *People Freed From Organizational Constraints May Not Know What is Radical or a Reform.* While working with the CPS staff in trying to help them comply with the SFA Regulation 80-6-1, I suggested that to sketch out what was going to be tried, the central staff do an analysis of a sample of individual school performance plans to try and obtain an idea of the *range* of possible options the local units were considering trying under their new "freedom" to experiment. The central staff did exactly that and spelled out the options in a frequency analysis.

For example, under the Board's reform objective, "Increase the four year graduation rate by 5% annually," the *strategy* reads, "Provide early intervention for high school students who are likely to fail a course." (Chicago Public Schools, 1990). A sampling of high school improvement plans indicated that the local units were going to try these remedies:

1. parental notification and involvement	37%
2. peer tutoring	17%
3. big brother/sister program for freshman	3%
4. intervention and remediation	13%
5. improved communications between staff and students	7%
6. committees to study reasons for failures	17%
7. explanation of school policies to staff, parents and students	3%
8. counseling of students	26%

None of these remedies are radical. They all have been tried previously. They all fit into current bureaucratic boundaries and rules and regulations. They all leave existing socio-economic arrangements untouched. Many assume that the unitary family still exists. None seriously questions racism, sexism, or monoculturalism as responsible agents in the low graduation rate (47%) of the high schools. None of the options question curricular viability or imply any curricular change is necessary.

Where would most local school councils obtain their ideas about change? The answer is probably the popular press and/or their own school related experiences. Neither of these two sources is apt to provide the stimuli for any radical change in what schools do.

Parental involvement in the form of Local School Councils is not apt to produce radical change or extensive reform in the schools.

Summary

The major question of this paper was: Can rational organizational models really change anything? Rational organizational models can initiate change but those changes will not change anything. Most people will be left with a vested interest in the status quo and reasonably happy and those without a vested interest or who are not being served well by an organization will be unhappy. Because persons are unhappy does not necessarily mean they know what will make them happy. They merely know that the current arrangements are not to their liking.

Retrospective rationality offers some promise of radical change. A change agent would have to come to power, institute a wide scale of reform, justify it in a post hoc way, and make sure there was enough in the reform for key groups to continue a new set of operations so the reforms could be institutionalized. For policy makers, that limits the discussion to (a) what are the possible ranges of options that could be developed or selected *and not specific objectives or outcomes before any reform is implemented*, and (b) *who* are the people who would lead this effort and how radical are they?

Reform occurs not by prospective planning but by picking a leader who knows what to do and does it. Everything else follows.

The scenario in Chicago is very unlikely to select any such leader and the *hyperrationalization* reform law and subsequent regulatory framework make reform of anything nearly impossible. Grass roots or not, Chicago's "business as usual" is quite likely to remain the same business.

Footnotes

[1]Extrapolated from "School Reform Legislation," issued by the Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance, Chicago, Illinois, May 1, 1989, p. 2.

[2]The author serves as the educational advisor to the Chicago School Finance Authority and has reviewed all drafts of the *Reform Plan* beginning in 1989.

[3]Data extrapolated from Chicago Public Schools *Systemwide Educational Reform Goals and Objectives Plan 1989-1992*. Revised March 15, 1990, p. 58.

[4]Ibid., p. 41.

[5]Ibid., p. 50.

[6]As the New York City Public School bureaucracy is referred to as "110 Livingston Street." See David Rogers (1968) *110 Livingston Street*. New York, Random House.

[7] Letter to the School Finance Authority from Don Moore, Executive Director, Designs for Change of August 13, 1990, p. 11.

[8]Letter to citizens, Parents United for Responsible Education (PURE), July 13, 1990, p. 3.

[9]A *metanarrative* is a theory of rationality that connects one's convictions with a transcending validity claim that goes beyond merely local contexts. C. Cherryhomes (1988), *Power and Criticism*. New York: Teachers College Press, p. 11.

References

Chicago Public Schools (July 16, 1990). *Systemwide educational reform goals and objectives plan, 1990-1993.*

English, F. R. (February, 1990). *An Apprisal of the Chicago Public Schools Educational Reform Plan, 1989-1992*. Chicago School Finance Authority, p. 9.

Kuhn, A., & Beam, R. (1983). *The logic or organization* (p. 329). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lortie, D. (1969). The balance of control and autonomy in elementary school teaching. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), *The semi-professions and their organizations.* New York: The Free Press.

Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social theory and social structure* (p. 251). New York: The Free Press.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Structure in fives: Designing effective organizations* (pp. 163-188). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Palumbo, D. (1985). Future directions for research in policy studies. In Yvonna S. Lincoln (Ed.), *Organizational Theory and Inquiry* (p .9). Beverly Hills: SAGE.

Silver, P. (1983). *Educational administration* (pp. 73-78). New York: Harper and Row.

Wise, A. E. (1979). *Legislated learning* (p. 47). Berkeley: University of California Press.

CHAPTER 2

ORGANIZING AND LEADING FOR LEARNING: THE INTERPLAY OF SCHOOL REFORM AND RESTRUCTURING WITH PREPARATION PROGRAM REFORM AND RESTRUCTURING

Charles M. Achilles, Dale Brubaker, and Harold Snyder
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

"The preparation of professional educational administrators is one of the weakest components of United States' education" (Guthrie, 1989, p. 228-229).
"Most programs for training school administrators range in quality from embarassing to disastrous" (Griffiths, 1988, p. 6).

Introduction

Some "Down-Side" Issues

Accepting or shrugging off such criticisms might be easier if they were from commissions of people outside education administration (EA). Unfortunately, they are not; they are from leaders in the field. They are not alone—theirs are not plaintive cries in the wilderness. These are general, broad-brush criticisms . . . What about what educational administration professors who have quite direct control of—research and inquiry? Here, surely, things are in better shape. Not really. Some have been concerned about the method and focus of research in the field of educational administration (Boyan, 1981; 1988; Bridges, 1982; Erickson, 1979; Haller, 1979; Haller & Knapp, 1985; McCarthy et al., 1988; Murphy et al., 1983).

There is a long record of criticism regarding research in educational administration. It generally is viewed as being of low utility to practitioners, poorly conducted and based in an inappropriate methodological paradigm. There is no need here to repeat these oft-cited and quite valid criticisms (Guthrie, 1989, p. 229. Guthrie relies also on R. Muth's paper at UCEA, Cincinnati, 1988 titled "Reconceptualizing Training for Administrators and Leaders: Focus on Inquiry").

There have been and continue to be many papers and reports that address the content (or the suggested content) of education administrator (EA) preparation programs (The Knowledge Base). Some address the content issue *directly* by specifying *areas* of study [e.g., the National Policy Board, or NPB (1989) recommendations of:

> societal and cultural influences on schooling, teaching and learning processes and school improvement, organizational theory, methodologies of organizational studies and policy analysis, leadership and management processes and functions, policy studies and politics of education, moral and ethical dimensions of schooling (p. 19);

Others address the content issue *indirectly* by specifying competencies or skills that an administrator should possess (e.g., the Assessment Center idea. See also Hoyle et al., 1990). Content is notoriously slow to change, research results take considerable time to have much impact (*if* they have an impact), and ideas offered as "research" often are not really as research-based as some would believe. Culbertson (1990) addressed this problem.

> First, borrowed concepts tend to enter textbooks before they are adequately tested in school systems. The result is that such concepts may be used *indefinitely* (emphasis added) in training programs even though their actual relations to school management and leadership practices remain unknown (pp. 102-103).

Considerable work remains to be done to specify the knowledge base for education administration. Achilles and DuVall (1990, pp. 1-2) reviewed some criticisms of educational administration's knowledge base by citing some vocal critics:

> Daresh and Playko (1989) pondered the knowledge base and its relationship to mentoring. They concluded that maybe we couldn't use mentors in education administration, for they don't really have anything substantive to show to their proteges and protegees. 'The research base on administration is not clear enough to guide mentoring relationship' (p. 90). 'When there is little evidence of what good administrators ought to do, a handicap exists for those who might guide their colleague's practices' (p. 90).
>
> *The knowledge base* in education and education administration hasbeen cussed, discussed and derided. Demerell (1985) called the absence of a body of its own knowledge "Education's Smoking Gun." The general low estate of education departments and faculties on major campuses seems to derive, at least in part, from educators' inability to define their own body of knowledge and specific methods of inquiry (Judge, 1982; Guthrie & Clifford, 1989). Derek Bok, President of Harvard, spoke to education's lack of a knowledge base of its own. To the extent that it is part of education, Bok's (1987) comments include education administration:

> "Because they have neither a strong profession nor a *distinctive body of knowledge* to impart, education faculties have *no firm anchor* for their programs or curricula. Instead, external forces *push them first in one direction, and then in another*" (p. 46) (emphasis added).

At least three areas—research in educational administration, program content and the knowledge base—seem still unsettled as we consider developing new educational administration preparation programs. Even if there are changes or agreements in these three areas, can we expect educational administration preparation to change dramatically, as some have suggested is needed? Probably not! Content is but part of the program. A second and equally important element is the delivery/context of preparation. This issue (delivery/context) should lead to stronger, more meaningful ties between preparation and practitioners. For example, the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration or NCEEA (Griffiths et al., 1988) recommended a professional model for preparing education administrators, including more concentrated work and involvement with "the field." This does suggest elements of a profession, such as an agreed-upon body of knowledge and appropriate methods of inquiry to access and assess the body of knowledge. Here are the research and content questions again. A "professional model," however, also includes an appropriate *delivery/method* and *relationship to the field as a part of context*. Achilles and DuVall (1990) commented on this issue:

> If we aspire to the professional model, then the education administration knowledge base should be at least partly based on practice (grounded theory). We assert:
>
> 1. The knowledge base in other professions resides in the *practice* thereof.
>   a. In medicine, the knowledge includes not only pathology, pharmacology, and anatomy, but also the interface between the sciences and the patient.
>   b. In architecture, it is built not only on design and engineering, but also on the interface of the sciences and the human being.
>   c. This "human" and practice condition exists similarly in other professions.
> 2. Only in "pure sciences" such as theoretical physics, metallurgy, nuclear chemistry, etc. is the human factor secondary. But even here the impact on humans is increasingly important.
>
> A knowledge base for a profession stands on at least two legs. One leg is the basic, theoretical underpinnings that relate concepts and ideas, help predict behaviors, and at least practically explain phenomena. The other leg is performance and practice. The application of concepts requires the processing of real-time feedback. It requires continuous adjustment, assessment of phenomena, and alteration of courses of action. Performance requires the practitioner to be a "scholar on one's feet." This type of knowledge cannot be acquired in the classroom; it requires a live setting with alive people. It includes a set of skills as well as abstract knowledge. We need to address this with a classic skill-

> building approach. Note the analogy to the pianist and the piano. One can study music history, style, interpretation, harmony, but until one develops enough skill at the keyboard, the knowledge will not be evident (p. 3).

Given the preceding considerations, the time seems right for educational administration program developers to consider program context and new program-delivery models. Some are being used successfully in other professions. Development and testing of these models should proceed while content (knowledge base) issues are being resolved so we will not end up with new wines in old bottles. When people think of "restructuring," they often think of changes in *organization and structure* to accompany changing roles, rights and responsibilities. In this time of "school structuring," educational administration needs attention to restructuring in this sense. Much like a grand jig-saw puzzle, many of the pieces are on the table. Some collective action is needed to put them together. How might the puzzle go together?

Some Pieces of the Puzzle

Andragogy/Pedagogy and Synergogy

The traditional preparation model for education administrators has been pedagogical in nature, proceeding from theory to practice, in classroom settings, with lectures and texts, and with the professor providing the knowledge. Culbertson (1986) noted that two early texts on school administration—William H. Payne's *Chapters on School Supervision* (1875) and A. N. Raub's *School Management* (1882)—argued that administration was basically classroom management and could not be clearly distinguished from teaching. By the early 1900s scholars were attempting to *describe* administration and its functions to distinguish it from teaching. Theory in the early years (1875-1925) was prescriptive and normative. Historical analysis and the school survey were the main methods of inquiry. Professors lectured in classrooms to groups of students. Changing concepts of the adult learner—and especially the adult professional as learner—suggest that if preparation does not go from practice (concrete) to theory (abstract and generalizable), then at least there should be judicious interplay between the two models and data bases. A concrete, practice-to-theory approach is built upon adult learning theory and andragogy (instruction of adults) as described by, among others, Knowles (1980; 1984). Pedagogy literally means instructing youth. Andragogy means instructing adults (Knowles, 1980; 1984). The term adult pedagogy is an oxymoron. Further, Mouton and Blake (1984) suggest another alternative, "synergogy," which "is an alternative mode of education that should be examined in light of the

benefits and limitations of two traditional approaches, pedagogy and andragogy" (p. xii). Synergogy employs major concepts of adult learning theory.

According to Knowles (1980; 1984), four key considerations in differentiating between pedagogy and andragogy are (a) the learner's self concept and teachers' concepts of learners,(b) role of experiences, (c) readiness to learn, and (d) orientation to learning. Children's education focuses on preparing them for the future. Adults have considerable backgrounds of experience that help them see relationships between new knowledge and prior knowledge. The preparation of adult professionals should build on prior experience as a first step to improved practice.

Knowles (1980) notes the differences. "Andragogy is based on the insight that the deepest need an adult has is to be treated as an adult, to be treated as a self-directing person, to be treated with respect. Andragogy is student-centered and problem-oriented" (p. 36).

Problem-Based Learning and Problem-Oriented Approaches

A problem-oriented approach to learning the practice leg of the educational administration data base has been gaining momentum; some work is being done at such places as Stanford (E. Bridges) and Hofstra (Silver Center). Preparation for medical practice is undergoing dramatic Problem-Based Learning (PBL) changes at several major institutions.

A model of preparation built at least partially upon problems-of-practice has potential for guiding educators to understand and define education problems—to move from *reacting* to externally defined problems (what Getzels, 1979, calls presented problems) to defining problems of education actively and accurately ("discovered problems"). Table 1 shows three of Getzel's problem types. Education leaders need to identify education problems and then seek powerful and creative solutions to them.[1]

One deterrent to advancements in the field and the impact of research is that many "problems" do not meet the criterion of problem. If you ask administrators to specify "problems" that they encounter, they may provide *solutions* stated as problems (we need more mathematics teachers), or statements of fact masquerading as problems (student attendance is only 89%). In the absence of clear problem definition, educators often succumb to "remedies" proposed by others. Administrators and professors studying problems of practice as teams of learners may be able to pose and frame important problems for educators to resolve. This idea extends to careful study of major problems facing administrators, such as equality vs. quality, equity vs. equality, how to have equality with high levels of quality, etc.

Table 1. *Three Categories of Problems to show One Key Difference in Problem Solving (Presented Problem) vs. Problem finding (Discovered and Created Problem Situations) (Excerpted from Getzels, 1979, p.11).*

1. **PRESENTED PROBLEM SITUATIONS.** A problem with a known formulation, known method of solution, and known answer is proposed by someone else and given to the problem solver. (This is the situation most prevalent in schools. Think of all of your classes and subjects. Given that the side of a square is four feet, what is the area?) The person applies technical problem-solving skills.

2. **DISCOVERED PROBLEM SITUATION.** The problem exists, but is formulated by the problem solver, not by someone else. It may not have a known formulation, known method of solution or a known solution. Why do children, at about grade 3 or 4, begin to seem to dislike school when almost all children are initially eager to attend school? Is this an American education phenomenon, or does it exist in other cultures?

3. **CREATED PROBLEM SITUATIONS.** No problem is evident until someone creates or invents it. An artist creates a painting. A poet expresses beauty through an ode. An advertising artist may be given a problem—design an illustration for an advertisement. Another artist starts with a blank canvas and proceeds to create a problem which the same artist then moves to solve.

Recent Work: Contextualized Learning, Situated Cognition and Anchored Instruction

As we consider restructuring—changing the form and structure of educational administration preparation—advancements in learning theory support some ideas that we already give lip service to in the field. We readily accept an internship as part of preparation.

Brown, Collins, and Duguid (1989) argue that "activity and situation are integral to cognition and learning (p. 32), and that we should consider "cognitive apprenticeships," approaches that embed "learning in activity and make deliberate use of the social and physical context" (p. 32). This approach is "more in line with the understanding of learning and cognition that is emerging from research" (p. 32). By recognizing the ways that situations structure cognition, new understandings are beginning to challenge the notion that knowing and doing can be separated.

The Cognition and Technology Group (1990) state that one aim of anchored instruction is to overcome Whitehead's (1929) problem of "inert knowledge" by "creating environments that permit sustained explorations by students and teachers . . ." (p. 3).[2]

Prestine and LeGrand (1991) relate ideas from cognitive learning theory directly to educational administration preparation. They note that "proponents of cognitive learning theories argue that learning advances through collaborative social interaction and the social construction of knowledge... not the rather individualized, isolated and decontextualized processes emphasized in most education settings" (p. 62). They underscore Shulman's idea of "the wisdom of practice" as a major source of a teaching knowledge base. After briefly making the case for situated cognition and social interaction, Prestine and LeGrand muse that "little effort, however, is evident in linking the potentially powerful precepts of situated cognition and cognitive apprenticeship to the professional preparation program to which such ideas may be most applicable, e.g., educational administration" (p. 62).

An important consideration for this paper is the potential for relating situated cognition to ways to reconfigure the delivery of educational administration preparation. Concepts behind situated cognition fit closely with elements of andragogy (Knowles, 1984) and synergogy (Mouton & Blake, 1984). They fit with the concept of a "professional model" in that they require relying upon understanding the value of knowledge from practice and "critical theory orientations toward the moral and ethical considerations of administration" (p. 63).

Several roles for the professor emerge: guiding the student "through thoughtfully designed learning experiences that emphasize problem-solving *processes* rather than mere mastery of content (p.75), helping the expert practitioner in articulating and making overt the intuitive thought processes and accessing of professional knowledge inherent in the practice application" (p. 78), taking on the task of being a resource linker or provider, orchestrating group learning processes (e.g., in a synergy mode) or helping the group in cooperative learning in a cognitive apprenticeship , and helping the student understand the theoretical and research-based leg of the professional knowledge base (p. 78).

Prestine and LeGrand argue removing those who would be practitioners from the context and culture of practice makes little sense as this "implies a separation of 'thinking' about administration from the 'doing' of administration" (p. 82). Achilles and Hughes (1972) have demonstrated the efficacy of a model for preparation that "pairs" a practicing administrator with a person preparing to enter administration and places them in a planned program that alternates periods of full-time study with full-time mentorship in facing actual problems of administration.

The concepts of adult learning and ideas of cognitive apprenticeship (cooperative and collaborative learning) support the professional model of cohort groups and the idea that there may be a "cohesive and coherent

progression of knowledge acquisition" (Prestine & LeGrand, 1991, p. 82) in such preparation, rather than a mish-mash of courses taken at a student's convenience. The cohort approach is becoming more and more evident in selected institutions of higher education, often spurred by program reform and outside influences, such as the Danforth Foundation or the "Asheville Program" at UNCG (Brubaker & Snyder, 1989). The idea is not new. The Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) programs of the 1960s, the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA), and other earlier efforts pioneered these ideas; other professions routinely use the cohort model in preparation.

Accepting these ideas means seeking alternative *times* for course offerings, such as extended weekend seminars (note the Texas A & M Professional Studies Doctorate, and some alternate delivery modes used by Nova and other institutions). The "major programmatic change though is that all course must integrate the ideas of the cognitive apprenticeship, each becoming field-based experiences that link conceptual, theoretic knowledge directly to practice" (Prestine & LeGrand, 1991, p. 83).

The idea of revising, restructuring and redirecting preparation programs in educational administration will not be easy, for moving into new domains will require professors to learn and use new methodologies or revise their approaches. This is a difficult task, for as Dewey (1938) noted, what is in our minds limits and controls what we let in and contemplate:

> The way in which the problem is conceived decides what specific suggestions are entertained and which are dismissed; what data are selected and which are rejected; it is the criterion for relevance and irrelevancy of hypotheses and conceptual structures (p. 138).

This task will require professors to do such things as link theoretic and practical knowledge, conduct research on practice, work as coaches and mentors rather than expert lecturers, etc. The reshaping (organizationally and conceptually) of preparation programs (context and delivery) can occur contemporaneously with work on establishing a common knowledge base (content) and formulating improved research/inquiry skills (evaluating the field and extending the knowledge base). Contrary to the expectations of some, the "restructuring" movement, a precursor to moving education and its reliance upon knowledge, values, morals and ethics to a higher plane in society, must influence not only public schools, but also the content, context and structure/delivery of preparation programs for education professionals.

Some "Common-Sense" (?) Concerns

Most candidates in educational administration preparation programs have considerable experience in schools; many work daily in schools with

concerns and problems of schooling. Most enter educational administration preparation with a presupposed knowledge of education gained from work in education, preparation for teaching, and a long socialization in schools of 16 or more years of attending school. During initial educational administration preparation (often the master's level), having people in groups to learn the elements of education law, the "language" of educational administration, finance, scheduling, organization and administration theory, etc. in environments away from their education settings may make sense. Does this make as much sense at advanced levels? As people proceed through preparation for other professions (medicine, law) they get progressively closer and closer to their clients and the practice of the profession (Achilles, 1987). In education, however, the opposite seems true. Why? What is an appropriate mix of practice, theory and instruction-stretching technology in preparation programs? (A cynic might ask *cui bono* in the continuing standard emphasis on texts to the exclusion of contextualized learning.)

Today's educational administration students hear of "restructuring," of the need to "reinvent" education from top to bottom, and of the need to change schools and schooling because of "changing demographics." Are the demographics for educational administration preparation static? How can a professor get to know as much about restructuring as the teams of teachers and administrators struggling to implement the changes? [For an excellent discussion of school system culture *vis-a-vis* university culture for the preparation of school personnel, see Sarason (1990), especially pages 65-67.]

Potential for Experimentation and Growth: Improving Practice and Preparation

Preparation programs built at least partially from problems of practice (or study of exemplars of practice) will (a) develop a practice-oriented knowledge base, (b) build upon andragogy, and (c) forge local school-higher education links. A problem-oriented (problems of practice) approach allows participants to conceive of an effective leader as a reflective professional practitioner (Schon, 1989). Such a program will assist participants (a) to define and study actual problems encountered in education, (b) to consider related concepts, theories, models and practices, and then (c) to reflect upon the instrumental value of those elements for improving education. Equally with discipline-based, theory-derived knowledge and quantitative research methods, this training model will value (a) analytic skills, (b) intuition, (c) learning from practice and reflecting on practice as a method of developing part of a knowledge/skill base, (d) use of theory to explain, predict, verify, extend, and improve practice, (e) contemplative action sharpened by studies of humanities and ethics, and (f) artful use of qualitative evaluation skills to guide the craft of administration.

Table 2: Model of Progression of Training Showing Three Primary Levels of Emphasis (A, B, C) with selected examples

	Learning and Change Dimensions with Selected Processes				
Leadership & Preparations Elements	**Knowledge & Conceptual Control**	**Skill Building**	**Transfer of Skill**	**Independent Practice & Growth**	**Potential Outcomes**
A. **(How)** Study of Practice. Problem Identification and Analysis, Problem Posing. Separate Symptoms and Problems. Focus on Site-Specific Issues.	Self-Assessment. Reflections, Vision. Discrepancy Analysis. Site-Specific Org. & Problem Analysis. Nature of Problems	Cognitive Apprenticeships Specific Practica	See "C" Below	See "C" Below	Real or Discovered Education Problems that are Administratively Mutable
B. **(What)** Study of Theory. Acquiring a Knowledge Base and Skills for Problem Solving and Improvement of Practice. Designing Improvement Strategies.	Reading Lecture	Self-Assessment Change Processes Evaluation Human Relations Org. Development	See "C" Below	See "C" Below	Armamentarium Necessary to Initiate & Evaluate Change & Improvement
C. **(What & How)** Demonstration/Use of the Knowledge Base in Leadership Setting; Evaluation of Results. Implement and Study Change . Report Results.	Observation of "knowledge in practice."	Active intervention in projects, tasks, etc.	Mentor-Teams Practice in New Settings. Work in Comunity & School. Self Assessments.	Continuing Synergistic Model; Reflections & Sharing. Move to Evaluating & Using Data.	Improved Education Practice: New Concepts of School, Culture and Professional Practice.
The Why issues of Ed. Admin. rely on values, morals, ethics. These are built on humanities, liberal education, human relations and normal ethiquette (one should not be mean).					
D. School Commitment: A Directed & Planned Emphasis on Improvement	Restructure the Culture at the Setting. Work to Establish the New Expectation. Develop an Organizational "Safety Net" to Allow Persons to Use New Ideas, Skills and Strategies. Emphasis on Client (Close to the Customer) and Improved Practice.				Restructured School/System to Accommodate New Ideas & Processes.

NOTE: Level D shows school commitment and accommodation for new activities. Traditional preparation programs follow the BAC Theory-to-Practice format; new models might try the ABC path, moving from Practice to Theory. An administrator must know what to do, how to do it, and most important, why something should be done (Achilles, 1986).

An andragogical, synergogical and problem-oriented (or study of exemplary practice) approach has potential for establishing a database for instruction which derives at least partly from practice. Instruction in leadership built on the practice-driven knowledge base offers (a) the *promise of education improvement as an outcome of instruction*, (b) an opportunity to validate some theories, and (c) the vehicle of internship-like activities or theory/practice integrative activities as part of the training. Those improving their leadership skills can practice and hone them in the laboratory of their own settings, and through reflection, generalize and discuss the particulars with others as a means of understanding general applications. In the interplay of practice/theory—theory/practice modes in educational administration preparation, there are three (or four) important levels that might be addressed. In skeleton form, these levels appear in Table 2, a theoretic framework built in matrix form to show four steps or stages in learning and knowledge use. In this model, a knowledge base can be derived primarily from practice and generalized through theory and can include both knowledge and skill (which may be the artful application of elements of the knowledge base). Knowledge implies a level of conceptual control; skill is the translation of knowledge into useful action. There are two important skill levels: (a) the *acquisition* of the skill, and (b) the appropriate *application* of the skill. Knowledge can be expanded through study, contemplation, evaluation and reflection; skill can be improved through application, practice, evaluation and reflection. This belief leads to contemplation and use of elements of the "reflective practitioner" (Schon, 1989) concept in the preparation of leaders.

The model in Table 2 offers direction. Typical programs go from theory to practice (B-A-C). As theory is not ahead of practice in many cases (e.g., in restructuring schools), new models might emphasize a knowledge base built upon sound practice *and* translated into preparation programs following the A-B-C format. Throughout the matrix are ideas about some processes that may be employed to help a person move from knowledge (knowing about or conceptual control) to the acquisition and use of the knowledge (understood as skills and competencies).

Some Concluding Thoughts

Research continues to show the importance of several key variables in school improvement: the leader, the organization's culture, and various context and input characteristics. Some context and input variables may be beyond the control of school administrators to change (e.g., pupils from broken homes or low birth weight babies of teen mothers). Nevertheless, there are many manipulable

or administratively mutable variables that have promise to improve schooling—the conditions and outcomes of formal education—of learners. The preparation of leaders who have the potential to work effectively with these variables to guide education improvement is a major social task.

Education's leaders will need to know how to find, interpret and use important information to weave plausible scenarios of future conditions that will challenge educators. Important skills will be problem posing, information searching, data synthesis and interpretation, and human relations abilities, particularly in working with diverse cultures and groups. These skills will provide the "raw material" that a leader will use in persuasive communication with and training of colleagues and constituents. Skills in goal setting and change/change processes and guided practice in achieving goals (change) will be important leadership "tools of the trade." Other tools to help a leader may be problem definition models (discrepancy analysis, brainstorming and synthesis), conflict resolution and consensus-building approaches, delegation, human relations, evaluation expertise, and analysis ability (self-assessment, organizational analysis, etc.). Such experiences, tools and concepts can be derived from studying, analyzing and working with problems of practice (or from analyzing examples of exemplary practice) and then checking the results against research and theory. This checking of results begins to define the outlines of a knowledge base. This approach—practice to theory—has theoretic support but has been tried in structured ways too seldom in education.

Changing times, conditions, and demographics require transformations of education and education's delivery system, especially of educational administration preparation *content, context* and delivery. Education is entering uncharted seas. Navigation through the shoals of change will require creative leaders who possess clear visions for yet-to-be-determined goals. The change and growth of preparation programs demand no less. The continuing development of people is a legitimate and important task of education, and the development of top-quality leadership talent is education's ultimate challenge.

Other developments (e.g., situated cognition, etc.) provide guidelines for ways to restructure preparation programs in educational administration toward the "professional model" where "model" means structure as well as content. As schools restructure so should preparation programs. Indeed, think how much professors could help the school restructuring movement if they knew as much about it as those who are actually going through it IN PRACTICE. Is it too much to ask the professoriate and those in charge of educational administration preparation to be at the starting line with the rest

of the contestants? We need a process of preparing education administrators that is self-renewing so it can adapt to the new content. Other advice for professors?

1. Study practice.
2. Relate classes and theory to practice.
3. Have fun and make preparation programs interesting.
4. Build a knowledge base equally from theory and practice.
5. Value studied change, experimentation, and evaluation.

Summary

Ideas and concepts get into education and administration journals and textbooks more slowly than underlying events occur in practice. That is, by the time something that occurs in schools gets analyzed, researched and then published, the phenomenon has a fairly good head of steam and is moving along. In this sense, preparation for school administrators must at least trail the first wave of important events. One way to learn is to observe something in practice. Better yet, practice something, reflect on that practice and then analyze and generalize that learning through serious study and careful research. We streamline our understanding through searching reflection and discussion.

If people subscribe to the above assumptions, then they may see why preparation of school administrators should consider situated learning. Persons in preparation programs should work directly in school environments. We should relate in a theoretical way the *structure* of a preparation program both to situated learning and theoretic learning; to learning from a study of practice and to learning from an understanding of theory and research. Both types of learning have legitimacy in preparation programs.

There has been an extended debate about the merits of qualitative and quantitative research. Qualitative researchers struggled to be heard; quantitative researchers continued to assert that theirs was the only way of knowing. Synthesizers argued that people could improve their knowledge by applying both qualitative and quantitative approaches, by understanding the extent of something and the quality of it. Gage (1989) contends that underlying assumptions of the two modes of inquiry are not so far apart that the results of each could not be combined to provide better understandings. The use of knowledge from practice and from theory should also be combined in the preparation of school administrators.

Prestine and LeGrand(1991) explain how situated cognition, or learning in the context of a particular event, may be applied in education administration preparation. Most of us believe the old maxim: "Tell me and I'll forget; show me and I'll remember; involve me and I'll learn and understand."

For many years, education administration attempted to be a "science." Recently we have begun to worry that we are alienating ourselves from our professional practitioners. Simultaneously there has been a push for "critical theory," for attention to learning from "the field," and for the place of "reflection on practice." These newcomers have not said that they should replace prior emphases (theory, science), but that there is a place for both. How can it come about? Can we develop a scientific understanding of this practical event?

Footnotes

[1]E. Bridges (Personal Communication, 2/27/90) has noted that administrators may react to externally defined problems lacking known solutions or may react by redefining the problem. Granted. In the discussion here, problem redefinition could be considered a discovered problem. The other issue is more complex. The intent is that without sharp problem defining/posing skills, education administrators find themselves badgered by fads and commissions (ad nauseam) arguing that more math (or longer school hours or higher standards) will solve the "problem."

[2]The Cognition and Technology Group (1989, p. 2) explain that inert knowledge "can usually be recalled when people are explicitly asked to do so but is not used spontaneously in problem solving even though it is relevant." They note that Whitehead made "the provocative claim that, in schools, information was particularly likely to be presented in ways that make it inert."

References

Achilles, C. M. (1987, October). *The present is prologue: UCEA today.* Paper at UCEA Annual Convention, Charlottesville, VA.

Achilles, C. M. (1986, November). *The key triad: What? How? Why?* Paper at SRCEA, Atlanta, GA.

Achilles, C. M., & DuVall, L. D. (1990, August). *The knowledge base in education administration: Did NCATE open a Pandora's box?* Paper at National Conference of Professors of Education Administration (NCPEA), Los Angeles, CA: California State University at Los Angeles. (1991, Fall/Winter). *Record in Educational Administration and Supervision, 12*(1), 15-20.

Achilles, C. M., & Hughes, L. W. (1972, July). The paired administrator team concept: A promising administrator training model. *Planning and Changing, 3*(2), 45-50.

Achilles, C. M., & Hughes, L. W. (1971). Leadership for education in Appalachia project (LEAP). Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee. Unpublished.

Blumberg, A. (1988). *The craft of administration.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bok, D. (1987, May-June). The challenge to schools of education. *Harvard Magazine, 85*(5), 47-57, et seq.

Boyan, N. J. (1988). *Handbook of research in educational administration.* New York: Longman.

Boyan, N. A. (1981, February). Follow the leader: Commentary on research in educational administration. *Educational Researcher, 10* (2), 6-13, 21.

Bridges, E. M. (1982). Research on the school administrator: The state of the art, 1967-1980. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 18*(3), 12-33.

Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989, January-February). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher, 18*(1), 32-41.

Brown, G., Markus, F., & Lucas, S. (1988-1989). Acquired administrative competence: A survey of national distinguished principals. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal, 1*(2), 58-68.

Brubaker, D., & Snyder, H. R. (1989). *The Asheville doctoral program story: Realizing a dream.* Greensboro, NC: University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt. (1990, August-September). Anchored instruction and its relationship to situated cognition. *Educational Researcher, 19*(6), 2-10.

Coleman, D. C., & Achilles, C. M. (1987, Summer). An agenda for program improvement in education administration preparation. *Planning and Changing, 18*(2), 120-127.

Cranton, P. (1989). *Planning instruction for adult learners.* Toronto: Wall and Thompson.

Culbertson, J. A. (1990, Winter). Tomorrow's challenges to today's professors of educational administration. *Record in Educational Administration and Supervision, 11*(1), 100-107. Originally presented as the W. D. Cocking lecture to NCPEA, Kalamazoo, MI.

Culbertson, J. A. (1986). Administrative thought and research in retrospect. In G. Johnston & C. Yeakey (Eds.), *Research and thought in administrative theory* (pp. 3-23). New York: University Press of America.

Culbertson, J. A., Farquhar, R., Gaynor, A., & Shibles, M. (1969). *Preparing educational leaders for the 70's.* Final report, Project 8-0230. US HEW; c/o UCEA. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.

Daresh, J., & Playko, M. A. (1989, Summer). Teacher mentors and administrator mentors: Same track, different trains. *Planning and Changing, 20*(2), 88-96.

Demerell, R. (1985). *Education's smoking gun.* New York: Freundlich Books.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Logic: The theory of inquiry.* New York: Holt.

Erickson, D. A. (1979, March). Research on educational administration: The state of the art. *Educational Researcher, 8*(3), 9-14.

Gage, N. L.(1989, October). The paradigm wars and their aftermath. *Educational Researcher, 18*(7), 4-10.

Getzels, J. (1979). Problem finding and research in educational administration. In G. L. Immegart & W. L. Boyd (Eds.), *Problem finding in educational administration* (pp. 5-22). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Griffiths, D. E. (1988). Educational administration: Reform PDQ or RIP (UCEA Occasional paper #8312). Tempe, AZ: UCEA at Arizona State University.

Griffiths, D. E., Stout, R. T., & Forsyth, P. B. (1988, August). *Leaders for American's Schools: The report and papers of the NCEEA.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Guthrie, J. A., & Clifford, G. J. (1989, January). A brief for professional education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70*(5), 380-385.

Guthrie, J. W. (1990). The evolution of educational management: Eroding myths and emerging models. In B. Mitchell & L. Cunningham (Eds.), *Educational leadership and changing contexts of families, communities, and schools* (pp. 210-231). Eighty-ninth Yearbook of the NSSE. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Haller, E. J. (1979). Questionnaires and the dissertation in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 15*(1), 47-66.

Haller, E. J., & Knapp, T. R. (1985, Summer). Problems and methodology in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 21*(3), 157-168.

Hoyle, J. R., Glass, T., & Oates, A. D., Jr. (1990). *General professional standards for the superintendency.* Paper prepared for AASA. Draft.

Judge, H. (1982). *American graduate schools of education: A view from abroad.* New York: The Ford Foundation.

Knowles, M. (1980). *The modern practices of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy* (rev. ed.). Chicago, IL: Follett.

Knowles, M. (1984). *Andragogy in action: Applying modern principles of adult learning.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

McCarthy, M. M., Kuh, G. D., Newell, L. J., & Iacona, C. M. (1988). *Under scrutiny: The educational administration professoriate.* Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

Mouton, J. S., & Blake, R. R. (1984). *Synergogy.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., & Mitman, A. (1983, Fall). Problems with research on educational leadership: Issues to be addressed. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 5*(3), 297-305.

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987, March). *Leaders for America's schools.* Tempe, AZ: UCEA at Arizona State University.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1989, May). *Improving the preparation of school administrators: An agenda for reform.* Charlottesville, VA: NPB at the University of Virginia.

Perkins, D. N., & Salomon, G. (1989, January-February). Are cognitive skills context-bound? *Educational Researcher, 18*(1), 16-25.

Pitner, N. (1988). Training of the school administrator: State of the art. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, & P. Forsyth (Eds.), *Leaders for America's schools: Final report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration.* San Francisco: McCutchan.

Prestine, N. A., & LeGrand, B. (1991, February). Cognitive learning theory and the preparation of educational administrators: Implications for practice and policy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 27*(1), 61-89.

Sarason, S. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schon, D. A. (1989). Professional knowledge and reflective practice. In T. Sergiovanni & J. H. Moore (Eds.), *Schooling for tomorrow.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Whitehead, A.N. (1929). *The aims of education.* New York: New American Library, Mentor Book.

Appendix A

Some Ideas on Inert Ideas and Preparation Programs

The idea of inert ideas merits some consideration. Numerous studies (e.g., Pitner, 1988; Brown et al., 1988) have shown that practicing administrators not only claim that they don't get their useful information in higher education classes (Brown et al., 1988), but some denigrate and ridicule Education Administration (EA) preparation programs (Pitner, 1988). These persons overwhelmingly explain that they get their useful information while at work—that is, on the job and not in classrooms. "It is difficult to ignore the testimony of school administrators that their training programs are far from adequate in preparing them to resolve the problems they face" (Pitner, 1988, p. 368). "Fewer than 2 percent of elementary school principals credit their success as school administrators to their graduate

course work" (Pitner, p. 376). Pitner notes that among practitioner complaints of preparation programs is that "programs do not provide the opportunity for applying theoretical knowledge to actual situations" (p. 378). Perhaps professors of Education Administration feel absolved by Pitner's finding: "The denigration of professional training by practitioners is by no means confined to the field of school administration" (p. 378). These findings raise questions about the content, context and delivery of preparation programs in institutions of higher education (IHE). Inert ideas? Here's Whitehead (1929).

> In the history of education, the most striking phenomenon is that schools of learning . . . exhibit merely pedantry and routine. The reason is that they are overladen with inert ideas. Education with inert ideas is not only useless, it is, above all things, harmful . . . (p. 13).

To Whitehead, "Education is the acquisition of the art of the *utilization* of knowledge" (p. 16. Emphasis added). Without knowledge of using knowledge, knowledge is not much use, or as Whitehead says, "Knowledge does not keep any better than fish" (p. 102).

If the "stuff" of regular IHE preparation programs for educational administration is not particularly useful to those who would practice educational administration, we might begin with the notion that educational administration preparation programs are, like other IHE programs, composed mostly of inert ideas. If so, what must program designers do to relate the ideas and knowledge to usefulness? Can we design programs that make use of situated cognition, cognitive apprenticeships, or anchored instruction? And can we do it so that there is some excitement and life in our programs? Note Whitehead (1929) once more:

> The justification for a university is that it preserves the connection between knowledge and the zest for life . . . The university imparts information, but it imparts it imaginatively. At least, this is the function which it should perform for society. A university which fails in this respect has no reason for existence (p. 97).

CHAPTER 3

ISSUES IN CREATING EMPOWERED SCHOOLS

Paula Myrick Short
Auburn University
John T. Greer
Georgia State University
Robert Michael
Valdosta State University

Many educational, political, and public groups have advocated the restructuring of public education and the empowerment of school staff members (Cuban, 1990; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Farber & Miller, 1981; Frymier, 1987; Maeroff, 1988). Empowerment is defined as the opportunities an individual has for autonomy, choice, responsibility, and participation in decision making within organizations (Lightfoot, 1986). Jenkins (1988) states that "To empower others is to give a stakeholder share in the movement and direction of the enterprise" (p. 149). The assumption is made that staff members who are able to initiate and carry out new ideas by involvement in decision making will, in turn, create enhanced learning opportunities for students (Lieberman & Miller, 1984; Metz, 1983; Short & Greer, 1989). Murphy and Evertson (1990) have suggested that school participant empowerment is a component of restructuring. Efforts to empower school participants include providing teachers with a significant role in school decision making, thereby developing a sense of shared governance; providing teachers with control over their work environment and work conditions; and providing teachers with opportunities to contribute to the school in a range of professional roles: teacher, administrator, curriculum developer, mentor, or learner (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Cuban, 1990; Lightfoot, 1986; Maeroff, 1988).

The Empowered School District Project

A nationwide project, *The Empowered School District Project*, funded by the Danforth Foundation, Auburn University, and Georgia State University, is a direct attempt to help nine school districts create empowered

schools and empowered students. The purposes of the project involved the facilitation of empowerment of teachers, students, administrators, and other staff.

The project was initiated at a three-day conference of representatives from the school districts. Representing each district were the superintendent, the principal and a teacher from the participating school. Schools were included in the project based on opinions of national educational consultants and of the two project directors that principal-teacher relations were positive and the schools were recognized within their districts as being good schools.

During this initial conference, districts constructed a three-year tentative plan that reflected an initial year of *formulation*, a second year of *developing and testing*, and a third year for *implementation* (Greer & Short, 1990). The project was intentionally designed for a three-year period to give districts time to seize the initiative and to structure the empowerment process to fit their specific school context. Over the three years of the project, the principal, lead teacher, chronicler, and facilitator from each school met together with the project directors for four-day conferences twice a year.

The *Empowered School District Project* consisted of nine school districts representing a mix of urban, suburban, and rural settings. One school in each district was designated as the participant school. This school was granted autonomy by the district in budgeting, hiring, and scheduling. Some schools were given the authority to restructure curricula. The nine schools ranged in size from 225 to 2500 students. There were five elementary schools, one of them a private school; and four secondary schools. Districts in the project were from the states of Colorado, Utah, Alabama, Georgia, Texas, Missouri, and Ohio.

As part of the project design, a facilitator was selected by each school. These individuals were selected based on their knowledge about organizational change and the school context. The facilitators met with the two project directors during the first three months of the project to discuss expectations for their role in the schools. Flexible roles were established and included consulting, providing training to faculty in areas identified as critical by the school faculty, providing support to principal and teachers, and problem solving with the faculty and principal. Facilitators attended project meetings and conferences and, periodically, shared what they were learning among themselves and the other project principals, lead teachers, and chroniclers.

Issues in Empowering Schools

The project focused on facilitating the creation of empowered schools through the restructuring of decision making and the increase of participant opportunities for choice, autonomy, and responsibility. Several themes emerged as significant and powerful issues faced in creating empowered schools.

Knowledge and Process Needs

The empowerment of schools is a process built around a content. The need for content was evident early in the first year of the project. Schools that moved rapidly to initiate shared decision making and to grant teachers greater autonomy began the project with greater faculty consensus about the definition of empowerment. In these schools, empowerment was framed, not as a power struggle with administrators, but as increased opportunities to experiment with the school structure, teacher work design, and instructional processes. In schools that moved more slowly to embrace empowerment, faculty spent the first months attempting to develop an understanding of the empowerment concept. Faculty often requested articles on empowerment and spent considerable time in groups attempting to determine what made them feel empowered.

In addition to the need to develop an understanding of the concept of empowerment, school participants needed an understanding of group dynamics, problem solving, assessment and evaluation, and change in organizations. For most of the school participants in the slower-moving schools, this understanding was lacking. In schools where faculty were knowledgeable in these topics or training opportunities were provided, less time was spent engaged in these activities.

Process impacted each school's ability to plan effectively for new decision-making configurations, to develop collaborative teams for identifying issues and concerns to address in problem-solving sessions, and to identify areas in which faculty and students could exercise greater autonomy and responsibility. All schools experienced some struggles with a process. The project was not implemented with a specific empowerment model in mind. The project directors believed that change would be longer lasting and substantive if schools were to structure their own empowerment-change process. Each of the schools was expected to structure that process in unique ways.

Some schools moved rapidly to create a process for restructuring. Think tanks and empowerment committees with specific goals, objectives, and timelines; training sessions; use of the outside facilitator for developing problem-solving and group skills; development of new roles for departmental chairs; and other mechanisms created processes that accelerated the efforts of three schools to empower their participants. These schools had strong visions about what the school would become. In addition, school improvement for students was a dominant theme in these schools.

Climate Needs

Trust became important in granting schools and faculty greater autonomy in decisions regarding budget, curricular innovation, hiring of school personnel,

and the restructuring of the school day. Teachers in many of the schools did not trust the district office or school board to allow them to participate in significant decisions. Where trust was lowest between boards and teachers, early faculty discussions about the definition of empowerment centered on the school board and its control over teachers. These also were sites where teacher input into district-wide decisions was rare. However, by the third year, teacher perceptions of principal support and facilitation of the empowerment process within the individual school mitigated against negative feelings about local boards.

Many of the teachers saw trust between principal and teachers as revolving around the opportunity to disagree without fear of reprisal. Opportunities for choice and autonomy were tied directly to teacher-principal perceptions of trust. For principals, trust centered on teachers' abilities to handle the responsibilities of decision making and choice. As the process of empowerment began in each school, many opportunities to demonstrate responsibility and competence in decision making arose; this facilitated a growing trust between principals and teachers. In the more empowered schools, much of this trust already had been established. The focus on empowerment seemed to deepen the trust. One of these schools faced union teacher strikes during the third year. In a district-wide vote by teachers, this particular school was identified as the best school for teachers in the district with a climate of trust and respect between faculty and administration.

The restructuring of decision making and problem solving that occurs in empowered schools forces disclosure of concerns and ideological differences that normally are not debated in most school organizations. The unleashing of these differences can create great conflict where the trust level is low. Schools in the project that functioned at a high level of trust saw these disclosures as opportunities for positive change. Where strong levels of trust among faculty did not exist, faculty continued to question the intent of the project as well as the motivation of those teachers who attempted to focus the faculty on activities for empowerment.

An individual teacher's trust for one's own ability to make good decisions and take responsibility for the impact of decisions is important in empowered schools. Though this aspect of trust seemed to be different among teachers without regard to the level of empowerment in a school, teachers in the "opportunity" schools demonstrated a greater level of confidence in their planning and decision-making abilities by initiating committee topics, taking responsibility for field testing ideas generated in the teams, and developing strategies to address problems identified by empowerment teams. Teachers in the other schools characteristically waited for someone else to take initiative on problem-solving endeavors. In addition, many expressed little interest in undertaking a coordinating role when innovative ideas were generated by the empowerment teams.

Risk taking became an issue in the empowerment effort. School staffs that supported a high level of risk-taking behavior among the faculty approached empowerment in substantially different ways from those schools with low levels of tolerance for experimentation and risk taking. For example, two schools in the project characterized as risk takers sought greater collaboration with the public in funding efforts as well as training and problem-solving assistance for their schools. Reorganization of the school structure was more substantive in these schools.

Commitment Needs

The need for a critical mass of teacher commitment for the restructuring of roles, responsibilities, and instruction to succeed exists in schools. Further, a critical mass in support of a change effort seems to overcome resistance and creates a momentum that erodes the inertia typical in many schools. The building of this critical mass was evolutionary in these nine schools and could not be forced.

There were distinct evolutionary shifts in the empowerment process, usually centered around a critical incident. External threats to a school's efforts to function as an autonomous school often rallied faculty involvement and support for the school's empowerment activities. For example, new district mandates that differed from faculty philosophies about teaching children, forced faculty meetings, strategy sessions, and a unification of faculty in increased efforts to develop even more powerful empowerment strategies for children.

Facilitative Needs

The facilitators selected to work in each school were critical in helping the schools frame problems, understand what was happening in the change process, and maintain a focus on the evolutionary nature of creating an empowered school. Facilitators provided a safe means whereby the principals could test perceptions, vent frustrations, and check progress.

One of the most powerful roles that facilitators played was collaborative problem-framer and problem-solver with a school staff. Because facilitators were knowledgeable about the change process in all of the project schools, they were able to help their particular school to understand that some events are typical in change efforts. This knowledge seemed to keep schools from panicking and becoming more frustrated. At the same time, the schools learned to become better at identifying and developing solutions to important problems that hindered advancement toward school goals. Facilitators served both as role models in this effort as well as trainers in more productive ways of collaborative problem solving and decision making.

Conclusions

Empowerment is evolutionary; schools cannot be told how to empower participants. Facilitators of this process cannot take control of the process and tell participants what to do. Critical issues in creating empowered schools force attention to building trust within a school system organization as well as in an individual school. Efforts in helping school participants frame problems and processes are critical. Important to empowerment may be efforts to create school environments supportive of risk taking and experimentation. Attention should be given to the potential effect of critical events on the change effort.

References

Chubb, J., & Moe, T. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.

Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. *Educational Researcher, 19*(1), 3-13.

Farber, B. A., & Miller, J. (1981). Teacher burnout: A psychoeducational perspective. *Teachers College Record, 83*, 235-245.

Frymier, J. (1987). Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*, 9-14.

Greer, J. T., & Short, P. M. (1990). The empowered school district project. A grant report submitted to the Danforth Foundation.

Jenkins, K. (1988). Metaphor and mindset for educational leadership. *The Educational Forum, 52*(2), 143-151.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1984). *Teachers, their world and their work: Implications for school improvement.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1986). On goodness of schools: Themes of empowerment. *Peabody Journal of Education, 63*(3), 9-28.

Maeroff, G. I. (1988). A blueprint for empowering teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(71), 472-477.

Metz, M. H. (1983). Sources of constructive social relationships in urban magnet school. *American Journal of Education, 91*, 202-245.

Murphy, J. & Evertson, C. (1990). *Restructuring schools: Capturing the phenomena.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Associaton, Boston, MA.

Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (1989). *Increasing teacher autonomy through shared governance: Effects on policy making and student outcomes.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

CHAPTER 4

WHO KNOWS WHAT? SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT

Robert Prickett
Western Kentucky University
Jack Flanigan and Mike Richardson
Clemson University
Garth Petrie
Murray State University

Proponents of school reform and restructuring have proposed several concepts to enhance the ability of school administrators to be "instructional leaders" (Bancroft & Lezotte, 1985). With emphasis on student achievement, instructional leaders for the next decade must be prepared to empower educational professionals, at all levels of the organization, to achieve the mission of the schools. Many reform factors have evolved from court decisions and reactions by state legislatures (Burns & Howes, 1988). Based on the June, 1989, decision of the Kentucky Supreme Court that education in the state was unconstitutional and the reaction by the Kentucky General Assembly [legislature] requiring site-based management to address these mandates, interest developed concerning "Who knows what about site-based management?" Research was initiated to determine the extent of knowledge and use of site-based management concepts as perceived by a national sample of professors of educational administration, graduate students in educational administration programs, and practicing school administrators.

The subject of site-based management is a much used topic of discussion in more than 30 states. School-based management is an idea whose time has come for many school systems across the United States. SBM, as it is sometimes called, is on line, fully operational in several school systems, and an option to be considered by reformers.

The legacy of the system of school management covers more than one hundred years. It was born out of a mandate by legislatures to establish a system of common schools to educate children to meet the needs of society in a rapidly industrializing age. The centralized system of schools was developed from a

decentralized system of one-room schools that was unable to educate children to meet the needs of society. The new, centralized system evolved with the bureaucratic management system that we know today.

Public education has lapsed into a stalemate in many areas of the country. Many state systems are underfunded, resulting in less than adequate schools, leaving the education of the children in these schools in jeopardy. People are demanding fundamental change. The question is: Will the management change be a partial or total one?

By definition, site-based management transfers operational decision making from the central district office to individual schools. Mertens and Yarger (1988) believe site-based management (SBM) could provide for fully empowering and involving teachers in professional matters that concern them. SBM could provide the impetus and the structure for better aligning the best of professional teacher culture with school policy making and administration.

Site-based management is often thought of in regard to other goals. In theory, SBM provides conditions for developing teaching as a profession. Central to the concept of site-based management is involving those "closest to the action," the key players, with making decisions. Site-based management provides an opportunity for bringing the expertise and experience of teachers to bear on educational problem solving and agenda determination (Mertens & Yarger, 1988).

School administrators are likely to support site-based management because it helps them to escape the bureaucratic control of the central office (Mertens & Yarger, 1988). Administrators will not likely seize upon site-based management's potential for increasing teacher empowerment and involvement. Site-based management, however, may be an idea whose time has come politically.

Whenever the subject of SBM is brought up for discussion, there is a fundamental lack of understanding of the real issues involved in school improvement. Part of this failure to understand the real issues may lie in the choice of words. Site-based management implies that a school's staff makes all the decisions. Such an interpretation fails to recognize that decisions made at school sites are the major impetus for educational improvement and change. Proponents of SBM believe the focus on the school as a "center for decision making and renewal" is critical to the reform of education and the development of schools to meet 21st century needs. A significant difference exists between talking about schools as centers for renewal and depicting them as bases for management. The differences arise because the work center has two different meanings. Most educators agree that an individual school should be the focal point to affect change and bring about an improvement. There is less agreement that the school should be the site of professional inquiry and reflective practice—the place for the critical thinking, dialogue, decision making, action and evaluation that determines educational change (Clark & Sirotnik, 1988).

The literature on educational reform and site-based management illustrates that in the 1960s and 1970s, forms of site-based management, usually referred to as "decentralization" and "school-site budgeting," rose to popularity (Carr, 1988). These were adopted to give political power to local communities, increase administrative efficiency, and offset state authority (Wissler & Ortiz, 1986). In the late 1980s, however, site-based management became the center of national attention for significantly different reasons (Dreyfuss, 1988). Site-based management (SBM) was implemented to influence change in the educational process by empowering school staffs to facilitate improvement in education (Carnegie Forum, 1986).

The concepts of SBM are borrowed from business and industry. The trend toward decentralization of authority was noted by Naisbitt (1982) in *Megatrends* and Peters (1989) in *Thriving on Chaos*. Senge (1990) gave new emphasis on the learning disorders of organizations and the necessity to decentralize. The strategy of site-based management is perhaps best understood within the context of applying Deming's theory, labeled "Theory Z" by Ouche (Lewis, 1985), to complex educational organizations. These basic concepts have become well known from the research on school effectiveness, particularly by the research of Edmonds (1979) and Guthrie (1986).

Although the literature provides illustrations of many forms of SBM, David (1989) noted that the essence of SBM is school-level autonomy, plus participatory decision making. An AASA/NAESP/NASSP joint task force (1988) stated that site-based decision making is in operation when more decisions *flow-up* through the system rather than *down* from the top. This procedure allows individuals who are closest to the problem or decision situation to be the ones to make the decision: teachers on curriculum, principals on building-wide problems, and superintendents on district-wide decisions.

A search of the educational literature revealed numerous references to site-based management but little empirical research was found on the topic (Harrison, Kilion, & Mitchell, 1989).

Objective

The objective of the research was to identify the knowledge base of individuals concerning site-based management.

Methods and Data Sources

A review of literature, research, and data from experts in site-based management was conducted. A research instrument for a profile analysis on site-based management was developed by the researchers. Using a national network of professors in educational administration, the instrument was

sent for data collection to professors, graduate students in educational administration programs, and school principals.

Professors from 17 universities agreed to participate. Instruments for professors of educational administration, graduate students in educational administration programs, and school principals were sent to the participants. Instruments returned provided responses from 63 professors of educational administration, 82 school principals, and 216 graduate students.

The research instruments contained 33 statements concerning site-based management. Respondents were to answer "true" or "false" to each statement. The statements were drawn from literature on site-based management. The data were analyzed to determine the respondents' understanding of the concepts related to site-based management, the explanation of these concepts by professors in courses in educational administration, and the understanding by practicing principals.

Findings

The results indicate that the three groups—practicing principals, graduate students, and educational administration professors—have different perceptions of site-based management. Although all the survey results are not reported, the data herein are illustrative of the variety of opinions on site-based management. Only three statements, "Teachers are responsible for making decisions at the school level"; "In site-based management, leadership is not a crucial element in schools, rather management becomes the primary focus"; and, "Site-based management is like other educational reforms, a passing fad," were congruent among all three groups. These comments highlight the major finding: There is not sufficient and concise information concerning the attributes of site-based management. Perhaps this lack of information is best exemplified by perceptions about the research base supporting site-based management. Both professors and principals agreed that SBM is not supported by research while graduate students believe that SBM is largely substantiated by research.

Respondents also disagree about whether students, administrators, and teachers must participate in SBM. They also disagree on the primary focus of SBM and whether it has been successfully implemented; however, they do agree that SBM is not a passing fad (see Tables 1-10).

Table 1. *"Teachers are responsible for making decisions at the school level."*

	Y	N	x^2	.005
Principals	60	20	16.16	7.88*
Professors	43	20	8.40	7.88*
Students	153	53	29.42	7.88*
Totals	256	93	138.20	10.60*

Table 2. *"True site-based management does not involve additional funding."*

	Y	N	x^2	.005
Principals	31	51	2.44	7.88
Professors	33	29	1.30	7.88
Students	101	117	1.30	7.88
Totals	165	197	1.41	10.60

Table 3. *"All administrators and teachers must participate in order to have operational site-based management."*

	Y	N	x^2	.005
Principals	52	30	2.95	7.88
Professors	30	32	0.03	7.88
Students	145	67	14.35	7.88*
Totals	227	129	13.49	10.60*

Table 4. *"Students must participate in site-based management for it to be meaningful."*

	Y	N	x^2	.005
Principals	40	42	0.02	7.88
Professors	33	28	0.20	7.88
Students	135	79	7.33	7.88
Totals	208	149	4.88	10.60

Table 5. *"Site-based management is a relatively new term that is largely substantiated by research."*

	Y	N	x^2	.005
Principals	32	49	1.78	7.88
Professors	16	45	6.89	7.88
Students	132	79	6.66	7.88
Totals	180	173	0.07	10.60

Table 6. *"Curriculum issues are the primary focus of site-based management."*

	Y	N	x^2	.005
Principals	45	37	1.16	7.88
Professors	17	46	7.63	7.88
Students	71	136	10.21	7.88*
Totals	133	219	10.72	10.60*

Table 7. *"Site-based management has been used with great success in both large and small school districts across the U.S."*

	Y	N	x^2	.005
Principals	47	30	1.88	7.88
Professors	30	31	0.03	7.88
Students	143	59	17.47	7.88*
Totals	210	120	7.90	10.60

Table 8. *"In site-based management, leadership is not a crucial element in schools, rather management becomes the primary force."*

	Y	N	x^2	.005
Principals	21	61	9.76	7.88*
Professors	3	58	24.80	7.88*
Students	67	142	13.46	7.88*
Totals	91	261	41.05	10.60*

Table 9. *"In true site-based management, teachers note to employ the principal."*

	Y	N	x^2	.005
Principals	37	44	0.30	7.88
Professors	22	40	2.61	7.88
Students	85	126	3.98	7.88
Totals	144	210	6.15	10.60

Table 10. *"Site-based management is like other educational reforms, a passing fad."*

	Y	N	x^2	.005
Principals	32	50	2.95	7.88
Professors	17	38	4.01	7.88
Students	68	140	12.46	7.88*
Totals	117	228	0.25	10.60

Conclusions

Based on the results from the data, conclusions were developed concerning the perceptions of site-based management in schools. The conclusions and recommendations from the research provide insight for addressing the issues of education for the next century. To provide a productive educational environment for student achievement, collegiality must exist in educational administration with a shared understanding of the knowledge base and meaning of site-based management.

The most obvious conclusion of the research is the difference of opinions that the three groups have concerning site-based management. Whether the differences of opinion result from lack of exposure to the concept, failure to remain current on the professional literature, or a reluctance to consider new ideas, the implication is painfully obvious. Without appropriate information being supplied by professors who are training the next generation of administrators, graduate students in educational administration will be required to go elsewhere for their information. Likewise, if practicing principals are not cognizant of the concepts inculcated into site-based management, then those administrators and their schools will never change. The short-term question is, "What do we know about site-based management?" The answer is "Not enough." But in the long-term view, the real questions for future researchers become, "Does the program work? Does site-based management make a difference for kids?"

References

AASA/NAESP/NASSP School-Based Management Task Force (1988). *School-based management—Strategy for better learning*. Arlington, VA: The Task Force.

Burns, L. T., & Howes, J. (1988). Handing control to local schools: Site-based management sweeps the country. *The School Administrator, 45*(7), 8-10.

Bancroft, B., & Lezotte, L. (1985). Growing use of effective schools model for school improvement. *Educational Leadership, 42*(6), 23-27.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Report of the Carnegie Task Force on teaching as a profession*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Forum.

Carr, R. (1988). Second-wave reforms crest at local initiative. *The School Administrator, 45*(7), 16-18.

Clark, R. W., & Sirotnik, K. A. (1988). School centered decision making and renewal. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(9), 660-664.

David, J. L. (1989). Synthesis of research on school-based management. *Educational Leadership, 46*(8), 42-53.

Dreyfuss, G. (1988). Dade county opens doors to site decisions. *The School Administrator, 45*(7), 12-15.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership, 37*(1), 15-27.

Guthrie, J. W. (1986). School-based management: The next needed education reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 68*(4), 305-309.

Harrison, C., Kilion, J., & Mitchell, J. (1989). Site-based management: The realities of implementation. *Educational Leadership, 46*(9), 55-58.

Lewis, J., Jr. (1985). *Excellent organizations: How to develop and manage them using theory z.* New York: J. L. Wilkerson Publishing.

Mertens, S., & Yarger, S. J. (1988). Teaching as a profession: Leadership, empowerment, and involvement. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(1), 32-37.

Naisbitt, J. (1982). *Megatrends.* New York: Warner Books.

Peters, T. (1987). *Thriving on chaos.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday Currency.

Wissler, D. F., & Ortiz, F. I. (1988). *The superintendent's leadership in school reform.* Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

ISBN: 1-55996-151-1
ISSN: 1041-3502